

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-26 are pending. Claim 1, 9, 17, 23 and 25-26 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Claim Objection

According to the Office Action, Claim 9 is objected to because the claim is directed to a system but recites “said method.” Applicants respectfully note that antecedent basis for “said method” is provided in line 6 of Claim 9. Furthermore, Applicants understand that a claim should be directed to a single statutory class. However, Applicants respectfully submit that it is acceptable to have mixed limitations within a claim that is directed to a single statutory class. Applicants respectfully submit that, just as a method claim can have a structural limitation, an apparatus claim can have a method or process limitation. Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 9 is a proper apparatus claim, with one of its structural elements properly modified (further defined) by a method-like limitation.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011467) in view of Yoshizawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036273) and further in view of Spicer et al. (“Spicer,” U.S. Patent No. 7,249,188) and further in view of Lloyd et al. (“Lloyd,” U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055627).

Applicants respectfully note that the fact that a relatively large number of references must be combined to meet the claims provides evidence of the non-obviousness of the present claimed invention. Regardless, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Suomela nor Yoshizawa nor Spicer nor Lloyd, nor any combination thereof, shows or suggests the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Applicants respectfully agree with the statement on page 4 of the Office Action, which states that Suomela and Yoshizawa do not disclose distinguishing trusted devices from non-trusted devices in the same list. Spicer is cited to overcome this deficiency. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Spicer does not teach that which it is relied upon as teaching. Spicer teaches that a user can be provided with a list of pseudo-names associated with each network resource – the list will include at least “public access” network resources and “authorized access” network resources and may also include “private access” network resources (column 9, lines 12-27). Applicants respectfully submit that, from the user’s perspective, all of these resources would appear to be of the same type. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing in the list of pseudo-names that would distinguish one type of resource (e.g., public access) from another type of resource (e.g., private access), and hence there is nothing in Spicer that shows or suggests distinguishing a set of resources as one type (e.g., trusted) and another set of resources as an opposite type (e.g., non-trusted), as claimed. Spicer teaches that each record resource 300 includes a user access level field 306 that identifies the type of resource, but Spicer does not show or suggest that such information is presented (e.g., displayed in a list) to the user.

Furthermore, according to the claims, a trusted device and a non-trusted device are distinguished from each other according to whether or not a passkey is needed for connections with a user's device. However, according to Spicer, all connections (with any type of device – public, private or authorized access) require a user-specified password (block 500 of Spicer's Figure 4a). In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that not only does Spicer not show or suggest a list that distinguishes between different types of devices, Spicer does not show or suggest distinguishing between trusted and non-trusted devices.

To summarize, Applicants respectfully submit that the statement on page 4 of the Office Action is applicable to Spicer as well as Suomela and Yoshizawa. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer does not disclose distinguishing trusted devices from non-trusted devices in the same list.

Applicants also submit that Lloyd does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd does not disclose distinguishing trusted devices from non-trusted devices in the same list.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, and that these claims are allowable over the cited references. Each of the Claims 2 and 25 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 plus additional limitations. Claim 10 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 9 plus additional limitations. Each of the Claims

18 and 26 includes all of the limitations of independent Claim 17 plus additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa and Spicer, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 2, 10, 18 and 25-26 in combination with the limitations of their respective base claims, and also that Claims 2, 10, 18 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance as depending from allowable claims. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 7, 15 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and Spicer and Lloyd and further in view of Baptist et al. (“Baptist,” U.S. Patent No. 5,465,392).

Claims 7, 15 and 23 are dependent on independent Claim 1, 9 or 17 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer, Lloyd and Baptist, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17, it is also demonstrated that these references do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 7, 15 and 23.

Applicants respectfully note that the fact that a relatively large number of references must be combined to meet the claims provides evidence of the non-obviousness of the present claimed invention. Regardless, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Suomela nor Yoshizawa nor Spicer nor Lloyd nor

Baptist, nor any combination thereof, shows or suggests the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist, like Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd, does not disclose distinguishing trusted devices from non-trusted devices in the same list. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer, Lloyd and Baptist, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17 cited previously herein.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that each of Claims 7, 15 and 23 is in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable claim. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 7, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 8, 16 and 24

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and Spicer and Lloyd and further in view of Sormunen et al. ("Sormunen;" U.S. Patent No. 6,112,078).

Claims 8, 16 and 24 are dependent on independent Claim 1, 9 or 17 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer, Lloyd and Sormunen, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17, it is also demonstrated that these references do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8, 16 and 24.

Applicants respectfully note that the fact that a relatively large number of references must be combined to meet the claims provides evidence of the non-obviousness of the present claimed invention. Regardless, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Suomela nor Yoshizawa nor Spicer nor Lloyd nor Sormunen, nor any combination thereof, shows or suggests the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen, like Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer and Lloyd, does not disclose distinguishing trusted devices from non-trusted devices in the same list. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela, Yoshizawa, Spicer, Lloyd and Sormunen, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 17 cited previously herein.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that each of Claims 8, 16 and 24 is in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable claim. Therefore, the

Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8, 16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES LLP

Date: 5/21/2008

/William A. Zarbis/

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060